

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
at KNOXVILLE

ORDER

On November 20, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge H. Bruce Guyton filed a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 22) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Guyton recommended that (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment be denied; and (2) the Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment be granted. (Doc. 22 at 24).

Neither party has filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.¹ Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed the record in this matter, and it agrees with the Magistrate Judge's well-reasoned conclusions.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Guyton's findings of fact and conclusions of law. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 15) is hereby **DENIED**; the Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 20) is hereby **GRANTED**; and this case is hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

¹ Magistrate Judge Guyton specifically advised Plaintiff that she had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive her right to appeal. (Doc. 22 at 24); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”).

SO ORDERED this 11th day of December, 2014.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE